

WARREN COUNTY BOARD OF SUPERVISORS

COMMITTEE: DPW

DATE: AUGUST 21, 2007

COMMITTEE MEMBERS PRESENT:

SUPERVISORS BELDEN
 BENTLEY
 HASKELL
 MASON
 STEC
 GERAGHTY
 MERLINO

OTHERS PRESENT:**REPRESENTING THE DPW DEPARTMENT:**

 WILLIAM LAMY, DPW SUPERINTENDENT
 BRIAN HUMPHREY, DEPUTY SUPERINTENDENT OF
 HIGHWAYS & BRIDGES
 JEFFREY TENNYSON, DEPUTY SUPERINTENDENT OF
 ENGINEERING
 JUDY JOHNSON, FISCAL MANAGER
 WILLIAM THOMAS, CHAIRMAN
 HAL PAYNE, COMMISSIONER OF ADMINISTRATIVE & FISCAL
 SERVICES
 JOAN SADY, CLERK OF THE BOARD
SUPERVISORS CAIMANO
 CHAMPAGNE
 GABRIELS
 F. THOMAS
 VANNESS
 JOANN MCKINSTY, DEPUTY COMMISSIONER OF
 ADMINISTRATIVE & FISCAL SERVICES
 DAVE STRAINER, TOWN OF QUEENSBURY
 AMANDA ALLEN, LEGISLATIVE OFFICE SPECIALIST

Mr. Belden called the meeting of the DPW Committee to order at 9:30 a.m.

Motion was made by Mr. Geraghty, seconded by Mr. Merlino and carried unanimously to approve the minutes from the July 31, 2007 Committee meeting, subject to correction by the Clerk of the Board.

Privilege of the floor was extended to William Lamy, DPW Superintendent, who distributed copies of the meeting agenda and the DPW 2008 Budget proposal to the Committee members. *Copies of both the agenda and the 2008 DPW Budget proposal are on file with the minutes.*

The first item listed on the agenda, Mr. Lamy apprised, was a request to create a new Auto Mechanic position in the Maintenance Shop located in the Town of Warrensburg. He explained that the Assistant Shop Supervisor position, which had been vacated due to retirement, was being filled by promotion of an Automotive Parts Clerk. Mr. Lamy stated that he preferred to delete the Automotive Parts Clerk position, with a salary of \$25,652, and create the new Auto Mechanic position with a salary of \$29,191. He said that the combination of positions would yield a net savings of \$2,500 for the Department.

Mr. Belden stated that he had discussed this personnel request with Mr. Lamy and he clarified that the request was not for a new employee but rather to change the title of the position and increase the salary accordingly.

Mr. Lamy added that the Automotive Parts Clerk position was less valuable to the Department than that of

an Auto Mechanic and the person promoted to the position was able to perform mechanic duties while still fulfilling some of the duties of the Automotive Parts Clerk position.

Motion was made by Mr. Mason, seconded by Mr. Bentley and carried unanimously to approve the request to create the new position of Auto Mechanic, Grade 9, base salary of \$29,191, delete the position of Automotive Parts Clerk, Grade 6, base salary of \$25,652, and refer same to the Personnel and Finance Committees. *A copy of the request is on file with the minutes.*

Mr. Lamy stated that a second personnel request, to fill the vacant position of Auto Mechanic as previously approved, was also included in the agenda.

Motion was made by Mr. Bentley, seconded by Mr. Mason and carried unanimously to approve the request to fill the vacant position of Auto Mechanic, with a base salary of \$29,191, and refer same to the Personnel Committee. *A copy of the request is on file with the minutes.*

Joan Sady, Clerk of the Board, noted that the effective date listed on the request to create the new position of Auto Mechanic was listed as September 1, 2008 and she asked if this was a typographical error. Mr. Lamy replied affirmatively, noting that the effective date of the new position should be September 1, 2007. He added that although a September 1st effective date had been used on the resolution request form, he understood that he would be unable to fill the vacancy until after it had received final approval from the Personnel and Finance Committees at their meetings scheduled for September 12th.

The final request included in the agenda, Mr. Lamy advised, was to approve a supplemental grant agreement with NYSDOT (New York State Department of Transportation) in the amount of \$693,442 for additional engineering and ROW (right-of-way) incidentals in connection with the Woolen Mill Bridge. He pointed out that the breakdown of costs for the project were listed on the resolution request form detailing the Federal, County and Local shares. Mr. Lamy added that the Local share of the project, listed as \$44,549, had already been appropriated to the Capital Project.

Motion was made by Mr. Merlino, seconded by Mr. Geraghty and carried unanimously to approve the request for a supplemental grant agreement with NYSDOT as outlined above and the necessary resolution was authorized for the September 21st Board meeting. *A copy of the request is on file with the minutes.*

Mr. Bentley pointed out that the resolution request form listed the State Share of the project as 0% but included a dollar figure of \$94,139 as the expected project contribution. He asked if this figure was accurate and Mr. Lamy replied affirmatively, noting that the dollar figure listed was correct and amounted to approximately 13% of the total project cost. He explained that each year the State applied to the Legislature for additional Marchiselli funding for projects such as this and the grant agreements had to be revised as funding was received.

Proceeding with the review of the 2008 Budget proposal, Mr. Lamy apprised that the proposed Budget had been comprised over the past month through the cooperative efforts of his staff and he thanked them for all of their hard work. He noted that although the 2008 Budget proposal was higher than what had been approved for 2007, he said that he felt one of his most important functions as DPW Superintendent was to provide the County with an annual state of affairs for the Department and he had used the Budget proposal to do that. Mr. Lamy stated that as they had attempted to avoid Budget increases wherever possible, it had

increased in areas such as Bridge Maintenance, County Road Projects, Equipment and Road Machinery Replacement, overtime to meet snow and ice control needs and Capital Project expenditures. In addition, he noted, over the past several years they had initiated a number of Capital Projects, some of which had already moved to construction while others would begin in 2008, and the projects had progressed to a point where the County was obligated to contribute the Local Share. Mr. Lamy stated that he and Jeffrey Tennyson, Deputy Superintendent of Engineering, had spent a significant amount of time working with the Office of the Clerk of the Board in order to determine what had been appropriated and to make estimates of construction dates in order to determine the total Local Share amounts necessary through the close of 2008.

Mr. Lamy began with a review of Budget Request page A, the "Summary of Budget Request" document and he said that this page reflected the 2006 actual expenses, 2007 appropriations and the 2008 requests. He noted that a decrease was reflected in the Parks, Recreation & Railroad Code, while there was a substantial increase in the Transfer to Capital Projects Code. Proceeding to page C, County Road Funds, Mr. Lamy highlighted that the proposed 2008 Construction (D.5112) Budget request was \$2,638,169, as compared to the 2007 appropriation of \$1,759,364, an increase of \$878,805. He said that the reason for this was two-fold, the first part being that the infrastructure was aging, and not gracefully in some places. Mr. Lamy explained that, for example, there were two roads in the Town of Queensbury for which construction had been delayed in favor of the Corinth Road/Main Street project, neither of which were eligible for funding consideration under TIP (Transportation Improvement Plan) grant funding until 2012. Mr. Lamy stated that Brian Humphrey, DPW Superintendent of Bridges & Highways, had reviewed the roads and determined that something needed to be done to preserve the roads until further construction could be completed with TIP aid. The second element, he explained, was that they were only able to submit for CHIPS (Consolidated Highway Improvement Program) grant funding every ten (10) years. Mr. Lamy explained that if they were to resurface the two roads and submit for CHIPS reimbursement, future grant funding might be reduced by the amount received as these roads were not technically eligible. He stated that he simply wanted the Committee to be aware of the situation as something had to be done to fix the roads in the near future.

Referring to page C of the Budget request, Mr. Lamy apprised that the County Snow (D.5142) Budget reflected a 2008 request of \$1,570,590 in comparison to the 2007 appropriations of \$1,685,118, a decrease of \$114,528. He noted that the decrease was interesting because the Budget included a request to increase overtime budgeted in this area, which he would discuss further later in the meeting. Mr. Lamy pointed out that during the past year there had been a number of retirements in the Department leading to the loss of senior employees and he suspected that this fact had led to the need for increased overtime in some respect. He stated that total anticipated revenues for 2008 had also decreased to \$1,322,905, as compared to the \$1,412,453 appropriated for 2007, a difference of \$89,548.

Mr. Geraghty questioned the figures included in the Services to Other Governments (D.5148) code, and Mr. Lamy explained that the \$120,000 requested included \$40,000 for purchases made on behalf of the Towns and the remaining \$80,000 reflected funds deducted directly from the DPW Budget for the paving of Town roads. He said that revenues were received to offset these charges through agreements with the Board of Supervisors to charge the Towns for paving. Mr. Belden asked if only \$80,000 of the total was received as revenue and Judy Johnson, Fiscal Manager, replied that the entire \$120,000 would be listed as an anticipated revenue as all of the funds spent for paving and purchases made on behalf of the Towns would be reimbursed by them. However, she noted, expense codes were necessary to appropriate the funds for such expenditures.

Moving on to page D of the Budget request, Mr. Lamy pointed out that the proposed 2008 Machinery Fund

(DM.5130) Budget request was \$2,906,263 in comparison to the 2007 appropriations of \$2,230,765, an increase of \$675,498. He stated that he and his staff had reviewed the current equipment and determined that expenses were going to be incurred, through either major repairs, equipment rentals or replacement. Mr. Lamy added that there were major pieces of equipment that needed to be replaced which were necessary for the services performed by the Department. He noted that unfortunately they were no longer able to make purchases at Army surplus pricing and the Department had grown significantly, necessitating the replacement of those pieces of equipment that had come to the end of their useful life. Mr. Lamy said that they were spending significant amounts of money to repair equipment which needed to be replaced.

Mr. Caimano pointed out that the highways and bridges were the lifeline of the County and if they were not travelable there would be no tourism to generate income for the County. He said that although the total Budget request had increased considerably, by 10.6% from the 2007 appropriations, the increase was necessary to get the Department back into shape through the purchase of necessary equipment. In order to facilitate this increase, Mr. Caimano explained that he would ask Hal Payne and JoAnn McKinstry, Commissioner and Deputy Commissioner of Administrative and Fiscal Services, to review the situation and determine how much Surplus Funding could be used to assist the equipment purchases. He stated that the amount listed as the total needed to fix the County roads was approximately \$1.4 million and if they could ban that amount through the use of a five-year savings account, and in connection with the use of a significant portion of the County Surplus Fund, they had the ability to get the Department back into shape. Mr. Caimano apprised that this was a serious situation that called for special Budget consideration and action.

Mr. Lamy stated that in developing the Budget request, he and his staff had developed a ten-year schedule for replacement of County road equipment which would entail a \$1 million appropriation per year for each of the ten years, based on current equipment prices. He said that this was the process that had to be used to keep the Department up to standards.

Mr. Belden advised that he had spent a large amount of time with Mr. Lamy and his staff in developing the Budget and there was simply no way to further delay the purchase of the necessary equipment as extensive repairs had been made to the current equipment and projects had been delayed for as long as possible.

Discussion ensued with respect to the purchase of construction equipment.

Mr. Haskell stated that the County roads were the backbone of Warren County and he was happy to see the leadership taking the stance that the time had come to replace the equipment in disrepair and if that required a ban to facilitate the purchases, so be it.

Mr. Caimano agreed, adding that he did not mind banning the expenses, so long as there was some sort of savings plan in place to fund payments to the ban. He added that he was concerned about the overall \$2 million increase to the Budget, as well as the state of the County, and something had to be done to appease all issues.

Moving forward, Mr. Lamy apprised that pages E and F were simply a summary of costs broken down by Budget code. As there were no questions from the Committee on these pages, Mr. Lamy proceeded to the tab identified as A. Codes, and he apprised that the Public Works Administration (A.1490) Budget reflected a 2008 request of \$132,996, which was identical to the 2007 appropriations. Mr. Belden noted that no salary increases had been included in the request because they were unsure as to what the percentage increase would be for each employee, and this was something normally added by the Budget Officer during the Budget reduction process.

Mr. Lamy pointed out that although the total request was the same as 2007, the amounts requested for some of the codes listed under the Contract Expenses heading had changed. He noted that he had included \$1,000 for Travel/Education/Conference (A.1490 444) costs in the 2008 Budget request, as compared to the 2007 appropriations of \$511, an increase of \$489. Mr. Lamy explained that there were three prime conferences that he attended annually, those being the Winter Conference in Albany, NY; the Bridge Conference held in Syracuse, NY and the Summer Conference for which the location varied. In addition, he noted, because Mr. Tennyson was newly appointed, it was important that he also attend these meetings to introduce him to the New York State Association of Highway Superintendents and their organizational structure, and additional funding had been included to accomplish this.

Mr. Geraghty asked Mr. Lamy if he felt he would be cutting the Budget short by reducing funding to other codes in order to increase appropriations to the travel code, and Mr. Lamy replied in the negative.

Mr. Lamy directed the Committee to the tab labeled "D. Codes". Ms. Johnson apprised that although the Unallocated Insurance (D.1910) 2008 Budget request of \$70,000 appeared to be less than the 2007 appropriations of \$94,050, *a decrease of \$24,050*, it was not because it was based on what was actually paid in 2007 rather than the figure appropriated. She added that these figures came directly from the Self-Insurance Department and the insurance rates had been lower than what had been Budgeted for 2007.

Mr. Lamy apprised that the proposed 2008 Traffic Control (D.3310) Budget request, reflected on page 42, was \$486,183, as compared to the 2007 appropriations of \$489,180, a decrease of \$2,997. Mr. Lamy explained that although there appeared to be a significant increase in the Salaries-Regular (D.3310 110) Budget Code from the 2007 appropriations, this was not factual as the 2007 appropriation figure was erroneous. He further explained that all of the same staff were employed in the Traffic Control Division with the same titles as in 2007 and there had only been one raise given which had netted a salary increase of approximately \$4,000.

Moving on to page 45, Mr. Lamy advised that the proposed 2008 Highway Administration (D.5010) Budget request was \$184,477, in comparison to the 2007 appropriations of \$197,322, a decrease of \$12,845. He pointed out that under the Office Equipment (D.5010 220) code, \$3,050 had been appropriated in the 2007 adopted Budget and this figure had subsequently been increased to \$23,415, as listed under the 2007 amended Budget figures, for the purpose of installing a new telephone system. Mr. Lamy added that for 2008, he was requesting \$10,220 as both computer and software upgrades were needed for the Kronos time keeping system in order to achieve an acceptable level of performance. He noted that page 46 of the Budget request reflected a listing of the Office Equipment expenditures anticipated for 2008.

Mr. Caimano stated that rather than appropriating funds to DPW for an update of the timekeeping system, these updates might be necessary on a County-wide basis. Mr. Payne advised that only DPW and the Westmount Health Facility utilized the Kronos timekeeping system and Westmount had updated their system approximately one year ago. Mr. Lamy stated that it had been discussed that when the new Health and Human Services Building was constructed a new timekeeping system was going to be instituted for all of the County Buildings; however, he said, the decision making process for the new building had been delayed and he was not confident that the timekeeping system currently used by DPW employees could be maintained as it was until a new system was implemented.

Discussion ensued.

Mr. Belden pointed out that the Supplies (D.5010 410) code request of \$7,500, listed on page 46b, had

increased significantly from the 2007 amended Budget figure of \$4,843. Mr. Lamy explained that he had spoken about this item with Ms. Johnson, who had advised that she had based the request on actual expenses and had tracked the figures through use of the Budget Performance Report, supplies on hand and those that they expected to order for the remainder of 2007. Mr. Geraghty stated that the amount requested for 2008 was approximately \$800 more than the 2006 actual balance of \$6,757.19, which he did not feel was unreasonable.

As reflected on page 47, Mr. Lamy apprised that the proposed 2008 County Road - Engineering (D.5020) Budget request was \$385,596, in comparison to the 2007 appropriations of \$371,708, an increase of \$13,888. He noted that the appropriate change had been made to reflect the salaries of the current staff, and the majority of the increase was attributed to these adjustments.

Mr. Belden pointed out that the Office Equipment (D.5020 220) Code had increased by \$2,333 from the 2007 amended Budget figure and he asked if they intended to purchase something in particular with the increased funding. Mr. Lamy replied that page 47b included an itemized listing of the equipment they were attempting to procure for the engineering staff. He added that the laptop computer included on the list was for the Traffic Control Department for use in connection with the new machine they intended to purchase for traffic sign production, as approved in the prior DPW Committee meeting.

Mr. Lamy apprised that the proposed 2008 Supplies (D.5020 410) Budget request was \$23,850, as compared to the 2007 appropriations of \$16,073, an increase of \$7,777. He explained that the increased funding was necessary to upgrade software for the GIS (Geographic Information System) to become compatible with the Planning & Community Development and Real Property Tax Services Departments. Mr. Lamy noted that the Equipment Rental (D.5020 421) 2008 Budget request was \$30,000, as compared to the 2007 appropriations of \$19,000, an increase of \$11,000. He explained that this was because they had added another vehicle for the engineering staff.

Moving to the next portion of the Budget, Mr. Lamy pointed out that the proposed 2008 Maintenance of Roads (D.5110) Budget request was \$2,927,363, as compared to the 2007 appropriations of \$2,950,488, a decrease of \$23,125. He explained that the majority of the decrease could be found in the Contract (D.5510 470) code, which reflected a difference of \$44,926 between the 2008 Budget request and the 2007 appropriations. Mr. Lamy stated that the 2007 figure was higher because they had encumbered funds on a previous contract which was not paid until 2007.

Mr. Belden noted that the amount requested in the Equipment Rental (D.5110 421) code had increased by \$14,500 from the 2007 appropriations and he asked if the figure requested would still be necessary if they purchased the construction equipment included in the Budget request. Mr. Lamy replied affirmatively, noting that in order to keep their operation running they had been forced to lease equipment and if they were able to purchase the machinery requested, savings would be realized in the Equipment Rental code.

Discussion ensued.

Referring to page 51 of the 2008 Budget proposal, Mr. Lamy pointed out that there were deductions from the salary schedule for Paving Projects, Snow Removal and Services to Other Governments totaling \$200,000. He explained that these deductions set up the need to charge the Towns for these services to recoup funds.

Mr. Lamy directed the Committee to the tab entitled '2008 Proposed Road Projects'. Mr. Caimano asked if any of the road projects listed in this section could be closed out and Ms. Johnson apprised that they had

only included road projects intended for 2008 and had not included any projects currently ongoing. Mr. Caimano asked if it was realistic to assume that all of the road projects listed would be accomplished in 2008 and Mr. Lamy replied affirmatively. Mr. Lamy noted that a very experienced Construction Supervisor, who was currently supervising the paving operation, would be retiring in approximately one year and they were attempting to accomplish as many projects as possible with this employees assistance and knowledge, prior to his retirement.

Mr. Lamy apprised that the 2008 Proposed Road Projects listing was organized by Town and road and had been evaluated by Brian Humphrey, Deputy Superintendent of Highways & Bridges, and his staff. He said that normally they tackled a piece of road, cutting it into sections to meet Budget restraints, beginning with the point where they had left off on the last paving project. Mr. Lamy stated that factors such as the life and wear of the pavement, as well as the amount of CHIPS reimbursement received in the past, had been used to develop the cycle which determined what sections of road would be included on the paving schedule in any particular year.

Mr. Mason asked if the paving services provided for the City of Glens Falls and the Towns of Warren County were reimbursable and Mr. Lamy replied affirmatively. He explained that all of the paving costs were initially funded with County dollars and were subsequently charged back to the Towns based on the rates set by the Board of Supervisors. Mr. Belden pointed out that all of the projects listed in this section pertained to County roads, several of which had been delayed in prior years to aid with Budget reductions. He noted that some of the roads listed had to be addressed in 2008 or they would become irreparable. Mr. Lamy agreed with this statement, noting that Queensbury Ave. (CR 52), was included in the 2008 paving schedule and required resurfacing in the coming year.

Mr. Stec stated that he was generally comfortable with the list of projects intended for the Town of Queensbury; however, he asked if a wider shoulder for Corinth Road could be included in the ongoing construction project in light of the fact that there was a bike trail nearby.

Discussion ensued with respect to Mr. Stec's request and the Corinth Road project.

Mr. Gabriels noted that a paving project was included for Horicon Avenue (CR 11A) in the Town of Bolton and he said he had learned that NYSDOT was planning construction on State Route 9 which adjoined this County Road. He said that although he did want the County construction to proceed, he did not want the project to coincide with the NYSDOT project as it would be difficult to travel within the Town. Mr. Lamy advised that he would contact NYSDOT to determine their proposed paving schedule and he would plan the County paving project around that. Mr. Humphrey noted that the County project was basically just an overlay of the existing road, aside from approximately 4/10 of a mile which would be milled, and the entire project would entail approximately three days work. In light of this, Mr. Gabriels stated that he was not as concerned with the timing of the County paving project, and would still prefer that the disturbance to the Town be minimal.

Mr. F. Thomas stated that he would be willing to reduce construction planned for Stony Creek Road, in the Town of Stony Creek, in order to fund construction on Warrensburg-Stony Creek Road, in the Town of Thurman, as it was in greater need of repairs and was traveled frequently by his constituents. Mr. Lamy replied that before agreeing to this trade he would have to review prior construction on Warrensburg-Stony Creek Road to determine if CHIPS reimbursement was available. Mr. Humphrey noted that sufficient time had passed to qualify the project for CHIPS reimbursement; however, he said, he was concerned that additional engineering work would be required for this project because it included areas with ledges, unstable

banks, railroad tracks and a considerable slope. Mr. Humphrey noted that they were aware that this portion of highway would require extra attention and Mr. Lamy said that they would certainly consider Mr. F. Thomas' request.

Mr. Stec apprised that under the listing of proposed road projects for the Town of Queensbury, sections of Quaker and Blind Rock Roads were listed. He said that he drove Blind Rock Road quite frequently and did not recognize the need for repairs. In addition, Mr. Stec said that he recalled construction on that road having been done within the past eight years and he asked if the work scheduled was actually necessary. Mr. Lamy advised that he and Mr. Humphrey would review the data on Blind Rock Road to determine if repairs were necessary. Referring to the work scheduled for Quaker Road, Mr. Lamy explained that they were trying to fit this project into the TIP reimbursement process and there were some issues facing the road that went beyond pavement life.

Mr. Merlino reminded the Committee that, as he had advised in a previous meeting, he had met with NYSDOT and learned that they intended to close a portion of State Route 9 in the Town of Lake Luzerne to replace the bridge crossing the Hudson River in the year 2009. He added that NYSDOT intended to detour traffic along East River Drive (CR 16) for the life of the bridge replacement project, which they had estimated would be approximately one year. Mr. Merlino apprised that NYSDOT was considering providing construction services on East River Drive to be sure that the road was in shape for the detour route when needed and he asked Mr. Lamy if he had received any contract with respect to the project. Mr. Lamy replied that he had not received information of this nature from NYSDOT as of yet, but it was certainly something he could address at his next meeting with them. Mr. Merlino noted that NYSDOT was also considering the construction of a new bridge next to the old one, subsequently demolishing the old one at the projects completion, eliminating the need to divert traffic. Mr. Lamy said that he would research the matter and return to the Committee with his findings.

Mr. Belden stated that there was only one paving project scheduled for the Town of Hague and, although the construction would inevitably have to be done, he was willing to delay the project until 2009 in order to assist with the Budget reduction process, if necessary.

Mr. Bentley apprised that he was hesitant to delay the construction projects proposed for the Town of Horicon; however, he said, would be willing to compromise on the projects to aid with the reduction of the Budget, if necessary.

Mr. Caimano stated that there were some other areas of the DPW Budget that could be reduced, such as the equipment rental fees listed, and he asked Mr. Lamy to review these items and determine what could be reasonably reduced. Mr. Lamy said that he and Mr. Humphrey had discussed reducing the equipment rental fees included in the Budget request and had decided against the reduction so that in the event that the new equipment purchases were not approved, funds would be available if it became necessary to continue renting the necessary equipment.

Ms. Johnson noted that of the \$705,000 requested for equipment rental and maintenance fees, only \$45,000 was not revenue backed. She explained that \$660,000 of the total amount requested was charged to the corresponding paving projects for the equipment rentals and was received as a revenue.

Discussion ensued.

Continuing with the review of the Budget proposal, Mr. Lamy directed the Committee to page 74, which

reflected that the proposed 2008 Snow Removal - County (D.5142) Budget request was \$244,059 and was identical to the 2007 appropriations. He pointed out that \$100,000 had been included for regular salaries, and was deducted directly from the Maintenance of Roads code, while \$144,059 was included for overtime salaries. Mr. Lamy asked the Committee to turn to page 75b, which reflected a request to increase the overtime budgeted from \$144,059 to \$190,000 for snow and ice control. He said that the increased figure had been determined based on the amount of overtime incurred to date for 2007 and an estimation of the additional overtime costs anticipated for the remaining winter months. Mr. Lamy stated that he felt this amount would be necessary to efficiently respond to snow and ice events as they occurred throughout the winter months of 2008 in a safe and efficient manner. He added that if they did not budget appropriately in this area, overages would continuously be incurred.

Mr. Caimano suggested the establishment of an overtime fund with an appropriation of \$200,000 to cover such expenses. He added that the funds could be replenished to the \$200,000 limit each year, accounting for any leftover funds from the prior year. Ms. Johnson added that a similar fund should be established for employee retirements as currently the retirement related expenses were deducted from the Department's Budget as an unanticipated expense. Mr. Lamy noted that his Department expected to incur expenses of approximately \$100,000 for costs associated with employee retirements at the close of 2007, all of which would be deducted from the Department's salary code as unanticipated expenses. Mr. Caimano agreed that the establishment of a retirement fund to address such expenses was a reasonable suggestion.

Discussion ensued.

Proceeding to the tab entitled '2008 Snow & Ice Chart', Mr. Belden apprised that he, Mr. Lamy and Mr. Caimano had met to discuss the possibility and costs entailed of the County's returning to plowing all County Roads, rather than paying the Towns to provide snow removal services on a portion of them. He said that during this meeting it had been determined that it would not be beneficial for the County to resume snow removal on all County Roads because they did not possess sufficient snow removal equipment to facilitate the entire operation and it was less costly to continue to pay the Towns to provide a portion of the services. As such, Mr. Belden advised, the 2008 Municipal Contract and Highway Recommended Payment Rate, included in the Budget proposal, but had not increased from the amount approved for 2007.

Mr. Lamy agreed with Mr. Belden's statements, adding that he and his staff had reviewed the matter, and in doing so had performed a detailed analysis comparing plow routes, the location of existing salt sheds, supplemental equipment needed, available operators and additional staff necessary which had resulted in the same determination. In addition, he noted, he had only calculated the time that would be spent by the necessary employees on snow and ice removal. Mr. Lamy said that the additional workforce needed to complete the winter operations would be an asset through the summer seasons; however, he added, the additional expenses of this workforce would have to be accounted for also.

Mr. Mason asked if every Town was providing snow removal services on behalf of the County and Mr. Belden replied in the negative, noting that the 2008 Municipal Contract included in the 2008 Budget proposal listed those Towns providing services for the County.

Discussion ensued.

Mr. Lamy directed the Committee to the section of the 2008 Budget proposal entitled 'DM Codes'. He pointed out that page 88 reflected the proposed 2008 Machinery (DM.5130) Budget request of \$1,949,913, as compared to the 2007 appropriations of \$1,328,379, an increase of \$621,534. He noted that although the

figures for both regular and overtime salaries listed in the Budget request had remained consistent, he had included a request to increase the overtime funds budgeted from \$45,020 to \$60,000, based on actual expenses and projections for the remainder of 2007, and a copy of this request was included on page 90b of the Budget proposal. Mr. Lamy apprised that during the past winter both he and Mr. Humphrey had visited the DPW Shop and they felt that the Shop was being staffed appropriately for storm events and that they were running an efficient operation to respond for necessary repairs to snow and ice removal equipment.

Mr. Payne noted that the Committee had authorized the creation of an additional Automotive Mechanic position for the DPW Shop earlier in the meeting and he asked if this position would reduce the amount of overtime incurred. Mr. Lamy replied that the overtime costs incurred were a direct result of the fact that many pieces of equipment were in operation during storm events, which frequently occurred after normal hours of operation. He said that although the overtime would be distributed to more employees, the number of hours the Shop was in operation would not decrease.

Mr. Belden asked for the current status of overtime usage at the DPW Shop and Ms. Johnson apprised that to date they had spent \$41,000 of the \$45,000 budgeted for overtime costs and they still had the remaining winter months to endure.

Mr. Payne noted that overtime costs of only \$36,911 had been incurred in 2006 for the DPW Shop. Mr. Lamy replied that the overtime incurred was dependent upon the weather, and, as such, he suggested that they budget adequately to cover an inclement season so as not to incur a deficit.

Mr. Belden asked if increasing the overtime to \$55,000, rather than \$60,000, would be feasible and Mr. Lamy replied that it would be a step in the right direction, although he could not guarantee this amount would be sufficient.

Mr. Geraghty stated that if they were trying to develop a true Budget they should allow the funding that Mr. Lamy felt he would require to provide the services necessary of his Department. He asked Mr. Lamy if he felt the overtime figures included were overinflated and could be decreased or if these were the amounts needed to appropriately run the Department. Mr. Lamy replied that he would feel comfortable leaving the meeting knowing that he had presented the Budget proposal including the figures he felt were necessary to run the Department.

Continuing with the review of the Budget proposal, Mr. Lamy directed the Committee members to page 91, which reflected a listing of the equipment sought in the 2008 Budget request. He noted that following this page, were the requests for each subsequent Budget year through 2011. Mr. Lamy pointed out that a generator, similar to the portable one used at the Municipal Center during the electrical incident earlier in 2007, was included in the 2008 listing for use at the DPW Shop and headquarters, as they had no such equipment now and in the event of a power outage they lost the ability to operate. He added that over the next four to five years he would suggest permanent installation of generators at the DPW Shop and headquarters; however, he said, this would be a good start.

Mr. VanNess apprised that the Office of Emergency Services had acquired a trailer for their emergency tents and equipment and were in need of a half-ton four-wheel drive truck to transport it. He said that the HAZMAT (Hazardous Materials) truck could not be used to pull the trailer because the truck had been purchased with a grant that stipulated its use. Mr. VanNess explained that the vehicle would not be used very often and would remain attached to the trailer at all times. Mr. Belden asked Mr. Lamy if any of the DPW vehicles intended for sale at the upcoming equipment auction could be used for this purpose and Mr.

Lamy replied that he would review the inventory scheduled for auction to determine if a suitable vehicle was available.

Discussion ensued.

Returning to the review of the 2008 Budget proposal, Mr. Belden noted that if any Budget cuts were necessary they would have to be made on the road construction portions because he did not feel that equipment purchases could be delayed any further. Mr. Caimano stated that he, Mr. Payne and Mrs. McKinstry were going to review the matter to determine how the equipment purchases could be made through use of surplus funds and banning of the remaining purchase costs, while Mr. Lamy and his staff were going to review the Budget proposal to determine if it could be reduced in other areas. He noted that the overall Budget proposal increase was \$2 million, which was not feasible, and some reductions would be necessary.

Mr. Stec stated that he also preferred to sacrifice road projects in the interest of equipment purchases. He apprised that the Town of Queensbury incorporated the rule of thumb that there were 17 plow routes, necessitating the same number of tandem trucks, which had a life expectancy of roughly 17 years. Mr. Stec apprised that the Town of Queensbury adopted the standard of purchasing one new tandem truck each year to avoid any serious Budget increases and he said that the County might entertain instituting the same type of practice. He noted that the listing of equipment requests for 2008 entailed the purchase of three tandem trucks, two of which he had no issue with, due to their age; however, he said that he questioned the replacement of the Volvo tandem, as it appeared to be a 1997 and not old enough for replacement. Mr. Lamy replied that he would provide a detailed explanation for the replacement of this item.

Discussion ensued.

Continuing, Mr. Lamy directed the Committee to page 95 of the 2008 Budget proposal and he apprised that the Machinery (DM.5130) Budget request was \$956,350, as compared to the 2007 appropriations of \$902,386, an increase of \$53,964. Ms. Johnson advised that \$35,000 of this increase was attributed to gasoline purchases. Mr. Belden asked what percentage of the gasoline budget had been used so far in 2007 and Ms. Johnson replied that 52% had been used through June of 2007 and she anticipated that they would be slightly over budget at the close of the year, depending on the fluctuation in gasoline prices. Mr. Belden noted that gasoline prices were slowly decreasing and they might be very close to Budget at the close of the year. Ms. Johnson countered that the State contract pricing for gasoline was not as cheap as it had been in the past and fluctuated daily. In light of this, Mr. Belden stated that it might be prudent to leave the amount budgeted for gasoline as requested in the Budget proposal.

As per the request of Mr. Belden, Mr. Lamy reviewed the Capital Projects listing, which, he said, was included on page 36b of the 2008 Budget proposal. He apprised that the listing included all of the Capital Projects receiving Federal and State reimbursement along with a few special items which were listed at the bottom. Mr. Lamy pointed out that several of the projects included \$0 as the 2008 County Share, and this meant that funds had already been appropriated to sufficiently carry the project through 2008. He noted that the Lake George Basin Sewer (H166.9550 280) project listed \$510,000 as the 2008 County Share and he advised that \$160,000 of this amount was to bring the project costs up to date and the remaining \$350,000 was the Local Share required to facilitate the remainder of the project. Mr. Lamy advised that they expected to incur \$70,000 as the Local Share of the Beach Road Reconstruction Project; \$60,000 as the Local Share for the Alder Brook Bridge project and \$65,000 for the remainder of the Fuel Farm Meter Installation project.

Mr. Belden asked if it was reasonable to assume that the installation of fuel meters would occur within 2008 and Mr. Lamy replied affirmatively. He explained that if the first three meters, which had already been authorized for installation, were successful, they had already obtained a bid to install the remaining meters and they would be done in 2008, provided that funding was available. Mr. Lamy stated that they preferred to maintain the same installation provider for all of the meters so that the same technology was used at each site.

Mr. Lamy apprised that his staff had developed an estimate of \$415,000 as the costs to the County for bridge projects not included in the TIP system. In addition, he noted, he had included costs estimated at \$120,000 for completion of the electrical upgrade to the Municipal Center, a portion of which had been necessary as a result of the fire that occurred in March of 2007. Finally, Mr. Lamy apprised, he had included \$127,106 as the Local Share of the projects scheduled at the Warren County Airport.

Mr. Belden asked if the figure used for bridge maintenance could be reduced for 2008 and Mr. Lamy replied that he would certainly review the information leading to that number to make a determination; however, he noted, it was important to keep in mind that all projects delayed in 2008 would magnify what must be done for 2009.

Discussion ensued.

Motion was made by Mr. Stec, seconded by Mr. Haskell and carried unanimously to approve the DPW Budget, authorize the Committee Chairman to sign it and refer same to the Budget Officer.

As there was no further business to come before the DPW Committee, on motion made by Mr. Haskell and seconded by Mr. Stec, Mr. Belden adjourned the meeting at 11:06 a.m.

Respectfully submitted,
Amanda Allen, Legislative Office Specialist